

The Republican.

No. 16, Vol. 10.] LONDON, Friday, Oct. 22, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE CHRISTIAN JUDGE BAILEY.

LETTER XXII.

Dorchester Gaol, Sept. 12, 1824, being
a completion of my five years' im-
prisonment.

CHRISTIAN,

FIVE years have elapsed on this day, since I entered the Guildhall of the City of London to defend my conduct in the publication of Paine's "Age of Reason" and Palmer's "Principles of Nature," and a second bissextile year intervening has brought round the date to the same of the week. I may date my imprisonment from that day; for though not actually arrested until the 14th, I was in every sense of the word, a prisoner, under the sentence of the Court of King's Bench, at the moment of entering it for a Mock Trial.

As well as to comment upon your notes to the Book of Common Prayer, I am about to compare notes with you, and to see which of us has triumphed over the other.

You have made me a prisoner for five years, and have assisted to rob me enormously; but, in so doing, have you not raised up a power against yourself, vastly more formidable than any thing exhibited in 1819? Has my pen or my disposition been less active in, than it would have been out of prison? And have I not the benefit of an immense amount of sympathy and indignation for my injuries, which without those injuries, could not have existed?

In 1819, you thought to stop the sale of all Anti-Christian publications!

In 1824, you find them in full and unmolested sale, and of a character far, very far, superior, and more forcible, than when first prosecuted. You have, in fact established the sale of Anti-Christian publications, as a branch of the book-selling trade; and you have so established it that it will go on to be the most profitable branch in that trade, without

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

participating in which, no bookseller, shortly will be able to live. I will not fix a year, as the Jewish prophets were too wise for that; but I will let that stand as a prophecy.

I give you the word of an Atheist, and here I will prophecy again, that the word of an Atheist will, by and by, pass as the synonyme of truth; I give you the word of an Atheist, that the demand for Paine's "Age of Reason," and Palmer's "Principles of Nature," is greater now than it was in 1819. Of the latter work, I have sold two thousand clean in the past year, and find an increasing demand. If I had the means, I would stereotype both, and venture to work off five thousand at a time. The latter work, has, also, lately, been translated into the Italian Language, for the purpose of an Italian Edition.

By the prosecution of Mr. Hone's Parodies on the Liturgy, I was let into a grand secret, as to the effect which a prosecution had to increase the circulation; by knowing that secret, I have wisely profited; and have been triumphing over you Christians, whilst you have been crying out victory! whilst you have my bones in a prison!

Transubstantiation, in your Christian Sacrament of your Lord's Supper, is a farce, or something lower; but the transubstantiation of the body of a Materialist is not a farce; it is a serious truth. I send parts of my body all over this Island, even to America, communicating to my communicants, by which they receive salvation, and acknowledge it; and I defy you to chain up those parts of my body. You cannot imprison the whole of my body; nor that very part which you most desire to imprison! You can only punish the part that does not offend you: the part that does offend, you cannot punish; it thrives, and lives, and breathes, under your very nose: nor is it alarmed at your *avaunt*!

It is not only in the books that I sell annually, that my progress against Christianity can be calculated; these books of high interest, and some of them lent about until fairly worn out, so that, in some instances, the sale of one book to a particular person, zealous to lend it about, is as good as the sale of one hundred to as many persons, who keep it to themselves. I was informed of a case of this kind last year; that one copy of the "The Republican," regularly travelled from Manchester to Stockport by one rout and came back to Manchester by another: that the journey occupied a month, and this was done by handing it from one to another, by agreement, until near a hundred persons had read it. I incline to think, that "The Republican," more

than any other publication, is handed about in this manner, and read in little clubs. On this ground, it is probable, that one half of the books issued by me in 1819, are now moving about as fast as they can be read, and that, the passing sale, since that time, has been an additional power, still extending the same principle, and exceeding all arithmetical calculation. Then, again, it is not only by the books that we Anti-Christians act, each convert, each human being recovered from the slough of Christianity, becomes an oracle to his neighbours, and makes his tongue and his manners to be alike instructive, by feeling himself superior to every thing that is Christian.

In 1819, or in 1818 rather, the "Age of Reason" was a smuggled book, and almost every individual feared that he should be detected with it. Now, my example of making it so public and so common, has set aside all alarm, and it is exhibited and lent as common as any other book. All this, I attribute to the prosecutions. These prosecutions have brought out a new edition in New York, where there was not a copy on sale! In January next, the first celebration of the birth day of Thomas Paine will take place in that City, and, I engage, that it will last a century. The acceleration of this measure may be attributed to the English prosecutions of his "Age of Reason."

What honour, or what advantage, have you gained in all that violation of law by which I have been imprisoned and robbed? What good has your vigour beyond the law accomplished? Have you checked the sale of the prosecuted books? Does your Christian system stand more firm, than six years ago? Or rather, do you not find something more powerful than the "gates of hell" prevailing against it. Ah! Bailey! none of your prophets could foresee the invention and power of the Printing Press! It mocks them all! It derides your Gods and your Devils; and treats your old Mother Church, as what she is, *the basest of bawds*! She may go on to prostitute herself to idols, to both God and Devils; but enlightened man will abhor and avoid her company. I feel that it becomes me, to mock you, Christian Judge Bailey. An old man is only respectable, when he is not a persecutor, when his manners are not offensive, when he is not a hypocrite. The evils of tyranny, hypocrisy, and bad manners, increase with age: the trunk that produces them never ceases to grow.

Meditating upon the inutility, towards you, Christians, of my imprisonment, I have been led to consider the purpose

and utility of imprisonment in cases of theft, fraud, and all those offences which are not now counted as capital. I cannot see it to be useful; but I do see mischief in it; otherwise than in the case of insanity, or where the individual be disposed to do injury to self or others.

Since torture has been abolished, or as far as it has been abolished, imprisonment has ceased to be a bodily punishment. Weak minded individuals may grieve about it; but a strong minded man feels it not, and, in most cases, the friends, the wife, the children, suffer more out, than the prisoner in prison. The punishment falls upon the wrong person.

In some measure, imprisonment has become like transportation to miserable men, who cannot thrive at home, not dreaded, but desired. The idle like it for the sake of maintenance, and the unemployed, or those employed at sixpence the day, do but gain on the score of comfort. The county rate maintains the man, and the parish rate his wife and children, which instead of a punishment, becomes a benefit to the offending parties, at the further expence of the injured. Where it deprives a man of the means of producing property by fair industry, it becomes a robbery and an injury to the community. Where it does not deprive a man of the means of producing property, it has to maintain him in comparative idleness, with a few exceptions.

Some means may surely be devised of making an offender pay a fine without imprisonment. The practice of the Jewish Law, in making the thief or other offender restore a multiplied sum of goods or money was far superior to the modern mode of imprisonment. If, when mulcted in such a case, the individual has no property to pay, and refuses to accomplish by labour, he has no alternative but to become an exile from the neighbourhood; which, in many cases, would become the greatest of punishments; and, in all, security to that neighbourhood against his further dishonest practices. Better is it to banish, than to torture or imprison a man. If he settled in any other place, under the same government, and accumulated property, the sentence of the Magistrate may be at any time enforced against him. He has no security but in perpetual foreign exile. A harassing penalty of this kind would be a much more effectual punishment, than the existing mode of imprisonment, and no one at expence to support the offender.

Cases of murder, of cutting and maiming, or of all such as are deservedly capital, require the existing punishment, or perpetual imprisonment and enforced labour. In all other

cases, good law and justice may be dispensed without imprisonment.

Turning to your notes on the Book of Common Prayer, I come to one that corresponds with the subject with which I have opened this letter. In a note on the Epistle for St. Barnabas's Day, referring to the persecutions suffered by the early Christians, you say: "It is observable, that the very steps which were taken to suppress Christianity extended the limits of its propagation." Have you not observed, by this time, that the steps which you have taken to protect Christianity and to persecute the Anti-Christians have also extended the limits of Anti-Christianity? The cause and the effect has been precisely the same with the persecution of Anti-Christians and Christians. The principles on the part of the persecutors the same in both cases—to cherish and protect existing profitable abuses. You say, "the disciples (of Christianity) had such convincing evidence of its truth, that nothing could deter them from preaching it; and when they were driven from Jerusalem, &c. they exerted themselves in those distant parts to which they were driven." I not only doubt, but I am positively certain, that they could have no "convincing evidence of its truth;" but I grant that they who were secondary might have been deluded into a persuasion of the kind. The first preachers of Christianity must have been imposters. No such person as Jesus Christ existed: no Christian sect existed in Jerusalem, before its destruction by the Romans under Titus; therefore, there is clear and convincing evidence, that the first preachers of Christianity were impostors. The system might have been started by one man or woman; and if so, the imposition rests with that single person.

But the disciples of Anti-Christianity have one and all the most convincing evidence of the falsehood of Christianity. They see not only the defects of its history; but the whole of science, the whole of existing knowledge, scouts the supposition of such Gods, and such a scheme of theology, as Christianity presents. They do not follow the tales of one another; but each refers for himself to the facts, to the arguments, and to the things which are placed before him. Not so with your Christians, they had nothing but tales to rest upon, that increased in carriage, as do the oral tales of the present day. And this fully accounts for the sectarianism and hostile feelings that grew up and increased with Christianity. You see no sectarianism among the Atheists. As

Anti-Christians, we are unanimous, and shall always remain unanimous; though we may not all have the same amount of scientific knowledge. The persuasion of the truth of Christianity was and is founded upon ignorance: the conviction of its falsehood was and is founded upon a superior knowledge. Your book of notes exhibits, that, beyond matters of law, beyond the routine of your profession, you are a very ignorant man—silly, childish, dull, and hypocritical. There is not a sensible sentence in it: not one that can excite admiration in a literary mind, even if the mind be Christian. It is the dullest of all the Christian writings that I have read; and, I should think it utterly unworthy of my notice, were you not a Judge in the Court of King's Bench and one of my persecutors.

In the Gospel that follows this Epistle before mentioned, we are told, that it is a commandment of Jesus to the Christians, that they should *love one another*. How have they obeyed that commandment? To him, who knows the history of Christianity, it is evident, that there never was less of love among mankind of any country, colour, or sect, than among Christians. In the name of Jesus, they have been a uniform set of murderers of each other, and, there is no hope of amelioration in this sense, until Christianity be conquered and extirpated. This is one of my strong motives for wishing to extirpate it—that there is no unity, no love, no desire of mutual improvement among Christians.

One proof of the fabulousness of Christianity may be found in the fact, that St. John, who was a Platonist, uniformly makes Jesus to speak of love; whilst the other Evangelists make him to talk about war, bloodshed, tumults, persecutions, and every thing disastrous, and no where about love. You find nothing said about war in St. John's Gospel—because St. John was rather a disciple of Plato than of Jesus.

But whatever were or are the combined precepts of Christianity, the example of Christians has been most horrible; and they have exhibited the most miserable religious propensity to ferociousness and hypocrisy, that ever degraded that pseudo-rational thing called MAN.

RICHARD CARLILE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

Huddersfield, Sept. 12, 1824.

I WOULD make an apology for sending you the following remarks, which are upon something which has appeared in a contemporary journal, did I not consider it a right, nay, a duty, for every journal to discuss the opinions which any contemporary puts forth, provided, that such discussion be carried on with temperance, and without attacking the person as well as his opinions. Mr. Cobbett, the editor of the journal alluded to, is a man who stands high in the literary world, and has talents which are perhaps unequalled in the present day. But the greatness of Mr. Cobbett's talents ought not to be a reason why absurdities should pass without exposure; because, if the talent be great, the mischief is in ratio with its influence. I, therefore, take the liberty to make a few remarks upon the following passages in Mr. Cobbett's Register, hoping, that if I hold to erroneous opinions, some one will be kind enough to set me right.

In a letter, in the Weekly Register, addressed to, "Lord John Russell, August 14, 1824," there are the following words: "The performance of labour, I mean heavy bodily labour, is absolutely necessary to the carrying on of the affairs of mankind. *The far greater part of labourers must, of necessity, be only just able to obtain a sufficiency of food and raiment, in the days of their health and vigour.* This must of necessity be the case: of *absolute necessity* mind; for, otherwise, the necessary labour would not be performed. This being the case there must always be a considerable portion of the labouring class to receive, in one shape or other, assistance from the richer classes." And, further on, he says: "There will always be great numbers of indigent persons in the class of labourers. There is a natural cause for this. It arises out of the nature of the affairs of men; and if the employers of the labourers be so severely pressed upon by the state, they must in their turn press upon the labourers."

A pretty "natural cause" this must be, surely, which causes the productive part of mankind to be dependant, after a life of unremitting toil, upon the unproductive part! I should like to know what this "natural cause" is, which causes a part of mankind to go "harnessed to sand carts with bandages of hay round their legs" for stockings,

or to spend more than half their time, in a "heat of ninety degrees, swallowing cotton fuz," while the other part, who never produced any thing, who spend their whole lives in idleness and dissipation, are destroying as much, each by extravagance, as would maintain a thousand of these poor wretches. I should like to know what is the natural cause of this. Mr. Cobbett, surely, will not say that the cause is as natural as that which produces hail or rain. If he will why complain? The cause must be either natural, or unnatural. And if it be as natural as that which causes rain, Mr. Cobbett surely will not be so vain as to endeavour to change that cause, because he cannot want convincing, that, no endeavours of his would be of any use to change any thing which was established in the very nature of things. And if it be unnatural, it cannot be "absolutely necessary to the carrying on of the affairs of mankind."

But why are the "greater part only just able to obtain a sufficiency of food and raiment?" Is the earth so barren, that with all the endeavours of man, in the days of health and vigour, it will produce only just sufficient to keep him alive, and that he must starve when he is unable to labour? Or, which is nearly the same thing: is there a "redundant population?" Redundant population in my teeth, I expect. Why, then, are a considerable portion of the "labouring class" to receive, in one shape or other, assistance from the "richer classes?" Richer classes! How came they to be richer? Do they labour harder and live barer than the poorer class? Labour harder indeed! No, it is those who must either be relieved or starve, who are the labourers! Then, as the "labourers" can only just obtain a sufficiency of food and raiment, how came the rulers to be rich? Have they had food and raiment dropped from the clouds? If not, how did they come by such things? They must either have been produced by labour, or they must have come in some such a manner as dropping from the clouds. Come, I urge the point, how did they come by such things?

But, there seems, by what Mr. Cobbett says, to be a different kind of labour from that which is bodily. For he says: "bodily labour." The other is a labouring with the head I suppose. I believe that is the manner by which riches have been acquired. Nay, it must be, because, Mr. Cobbett says, "the far greater part must be only just able to obtain food and raiment in the days of their health and vigour." No imbecility, mind, but, "health and vigour;" therefore, the lesser part could not obtain riches by labour any more

than the greater part. So this other kind of labour, must have been head labour; a cajoling of their neighbours; for, without this cajoling, this head labour would never have produced them riches. No, let their heads ferment as they will if their hands do nothing, they must starve, without they can trick the labourers out of the produce of their labour by these fermentings. Therefore, this other kind of labour must be a cajoling, a tricking, the labourers out of their labour, for an imaginary something, which they were to receive in its stead. And, the event has proved, that it is a cajoling, by the labourers being sunk in poverty, while the idlers have acquired riches. Because, if the labourers had received an equivalent for their produce; they would still have maintained their equality. But I need not say, that they have not; as they are now to be assisted by the "richer classes," who are living upon the produce of those very labourers, in return, call them paupers, and vagrants, and what is worst of all, the "labourers" are now to be told by Mr. Cobbett, that this state of things is absolutely necessary to the carrying on the affairs of mankind! Better that there were no such affairs to carry on. Surely, the "richer classes" will not say, that he has been bribed by the "labouring class" to say this.

But, this cajoling, is not the only means of obtaining riches. No, we have crusades, conquests, going and taking possession of a country in the name of a something called King; murdering, or making "*labourers*" of the inhabitants, and then calling that, for which robbery and murder has been committed—*property*. The inhabitants finding it vain to resist, begin to labour for the then "richer classes," who soon learn to say "*sacred right of property*," and such like stuff; until, in a short time, it becomes a moral depravity, a kind of treason for the slaves, the "labourers," to doubt the right of the "richer classes" to consume the produce of their labour, while they are starving, or, so near to it, that, the slightest attack of sickness, or inability to labour, brings them so as to be unable to obtain food without receiving assistance from their robbers, these "richer classes."

That this has been, and is, the case, no one can doubt; nay it is absolutely the case in England at the present moment. Do not many of the things called "Lords, Peers," &c. boast of having descended from the butchers who cantoned into lots, the whole of England, and made the inhabitants labour to support them on pain of death? Where or

what then, is their right of property? Possession? The highwayman has the same right to the property he has stolen, and it ought to be considered, in the like manner inviolate until again stolen. The class of men who are living upon the hard earned produce of the English labourer, wrung from him in the shape of taxes, have as good a right to their ill gotten wealth, as the lord has to his estate, for both have gained it, by either fraud or force, and the man who would protect the one and not the other is either knave or fool. Start not at my saying, that the lord has no more right to his estate, than the pensioner to his pension; for he absolutely has not, because fraud gives as good a title to that which a man has, as force, or plunder. And no one, no not Mr. Cobbett himself, will say that one man has absolutely more right to an acre of land than another¹: all must be equal as nature left them, or found them, or, rather before man began to be what is called civilized. No man had then, nor can have now, more right than another to breathe the air, to feel the sunshine, or to endure the cold. No one would think of claiming the exclusive privilege of having all the beasts birds or fishes², no one would before man began to be what is called civilized, think of making game laws to protect the animals for himself, which Mr. Cobbett says, "God has given equally to all³." Then if "God" has given the animals to all, why not the land to feed them? because, the animals, without something to feed them, would be an injury. If "God" gave the land to a particular set of men, he would also have given them that which the land supported. But, as Mr. Cobbett says, that "God" has given the animals equally to all men, we may without fear of contradiction, say, that he gave the land to feed them on, to all men. And we may also conclude, that no man has more right to one particular piece, or tract of

¹ The same principle may be carried to every other animal, which has the same natural right with man, and proves that natural right to man is nonsense. The right of conquest is the question.

R. C.

² Conquest is the question. What can we conquer, is the *first* principle with mankind, in relation to one another as social beings! And in relation to every other animal. Every thing centers there, Friend Penny, and there is not, there never will be any liberty or equality but in power. We must learn to make ourselves as powerful as our aristocrats and priests.

R. C.

³ Leave the word *God* out of the question, and say that the Aristocrats, by force, by treaty, or by stratagem, have conquered the power to make Game Laws, and we shall see the thing rightly. The knowledge of a disease is half its cure; wise men say.

R. C.

ground, than he has to one particular species of birds or beasts.

It will be said, that a man, by hard labour and economy, may obtain something more than will maintain him; and, therefore, that the overplus is absolutely his own. Most assuredly, if he has not infringed upon his neighbours; and what then? Well, then, he has a right to exchange that overplus for part of his neighbour's land, yes, and what then? Well, then at his death he has a right to give it to his own son, or sons, and so perpetuate it in the family for ever. I say, no, his children have no more right to it, at his death, than they have to his debts. In fact, it is making the children of the man who sold the land, answerable for their father's debts; which is contrary to all ideas of justice. For, no man, nor set of men, have, or can have, the right to mortgage or to sell, the property of a succeeding generation. Therefore, all such purchases ought to be considered as a speculation upon the length of life, and at the death of the mortgager, to return to the common stock⁴.

By way of proof, let us suppose the world to be just begun, and one man and woman upon it; (Adam and Eve, if you like) then he is King or Emperor of the whole world. He beats your Alexanders, your Cæsars⁵, they had only part. Well in the course of time, they have a family, and when the old man comes to die, he says, "I had all this land before you were born; consequently, I have a right to do as I will with it; therefore, I leave it all to John: and you and the others, must be slaves to him, you and your progeny for ever." Who would not start with indignation to hear such a sentence; and if they could prevent it, who would suffer it to be put in execution? Again, suppose, for it does not alter the case, that we begin with the world as well peopled as it is at the present; and suppose one, or twenty, or more for it matters not, if they be short of the majority, to put their designs in execution by force; suppose one were to say, "I will have this piece of country, and you shall labour for me; you and your children shall labour for me and my children for ever." Would they acquiesce in

⁴ I wish one of our common-stock gentlemen would tell us how a common stock is to be divided among a people hourly fluctuating as to numbers and identities, other than by raising all tax or revenue as a rental? I fully understand what conquering means; but I cannot understand what *an equal division of land means*, so as to be practicable.

⁵ Not so; for he has no slaves. A man can only be a King when he has slaves for subjects.

R. C.

R. C.

this? Or would he have any right to do this? No, each being nature's⁶ child, each would have an equal claim upon her for support. It is the same in all cases; the children of one man have as much right to the land as those of another; nature having brought them into existence, has provided sufficient for them all, and all have an equal right to her provisions⁷.

Then, upon this view of the matter, it does not appear that there is an "absolute necessity" for the greater part to be assisted by the "richer classes;" because it seems, even under the present system that there is sufficient produced, to maintain the whole of the population, if the labour and produce of labour were equally divided. And why, should it not be so⁸? Where is the "absolute necessity" for one set of men to live upon the produce of another? And certainly, the whole of wealth is the produce of the labouring class. Tell me not that the land will be theirs; what is the land without labour? Turn the "Lord upon his vaunted estate, no matter how gotten, and without labour, what will he be? The man with an acre of well cultivated land will be "richer" far than he, and the Lord must soon come to be assisted by his "richer" neighbour, unless he learn to cultivate his own estate, if all other labour be kept from him. Therefore, strictly speaking, labour is the only real property.

What a monstrous thing then it must be, to hear some one say, that the state of things which robs nine-tenths of mankind of half their property to give to the tenth, is of "absolute necessity!" Talk of property indeed! But, tell the labourers that they have no property! Tell them, that they have no right to the produce of their labour! Tell them that they are the property of the "richer classes;" consequently, they must labour for a bare pittance to support their "Lords" in affluence! Tell them all this; aye more! Tell them, that they are not of the same species as the "richer classes;" but that they are born, actually designed, for their pleasure!

What indignation would every man have felt, had a "Peer," or a "Bishop" said, "that the far greater part of labourers must of necessity, be only just able to ob-

⁶ And Nature who?

R. C.

⁷ If they can conquer it, as the Lion does, not else.

R. C.

⁸ Why is it not so, is the question. To which I answer: because there is not enough of mental power among mankind to awe their tyrants.

R. C.

tain a sufficiency of food and raiment in the days of their health and vigour." Every honest man's blood would boil to hear such a thing. Why, he would ask, is it necessary? Is the supporting of bishops, lords, esquires, and the whole catalogue of idlers, absolutely necessary to make the corn grow? Could not the labourer live, after having produced something to support him, and something to spare to support him when he were unable to labour? Could he not live, if, after he had done this, he had not the bishop on the esquire (it matters not which) to come and take that something from him? And when he is reduced to the lowest pitch of degradation; the little necessities of his house sold to purchase food; his former comfortable clothing gone; hay bands and old sacks come in its place; and when he has come to this state, the bishop, or the esquire, to give him back a small part of what each had taken from him, and that part barely sufficient, to prolong his existence, that he may see the "bishop" or the esquire revelling in what he has produced! Shades of departed philanthropists! say, are these things necessary to the carrying on of the affairs of mankind? If they be, why did not some friendly desert keep me from herding with mankind? If they be, come hospitable grave and shroud me from the enormities of civilization!

This language may be very pleasing to the "bishop" or the "esquire;" but surely it is not the language of Justice. Surely the lover of mankind will never say, that it is "absolutely necessary to the carrying on of the affairs of man, that the far greater part of men should only be just able to obtain food and raiment in the days of their health and vigour," while the lesser part are wallowing in dissipation. With the bishop and the esquire it is a question of policy, whether it will be better to let the labourer starve right out, or just keep him alive. Were they sure the "labourer" would sit down quietly with starvation, the matter would be solved at once. But as the matter is rather doubtful, it is judged *expedient* to relieve the "poorer classes;" though in such a manner as to make them consider it more as a favour than a right. This is what they want. Only let them get it once established, that the "labourers" have no right to be maintained, that it is through the pity of the "richer classes" that they do not starve; let them get the poor right hunted down, and this established; then, away with all relief. The producer must starve, as is the case in Ireland, while the non-producer rolls in luxury.

JAMES PENNY.

NOTE BY R. CARLILE.

THOUGH I have given insertion to this latter, I do not take the same view of Mr. Cobbett's expression, as the writer has taken connected with his anxious efforts to improve the condition of the labouring people, of this and the neighbouring Island, no one can suppose, but that the bare sufficiency alluded to by Mr. Cobbett, is a very different thing to that now obtained. The very King supposes that he has but a bare sufficiency for maintenance; and the man who earns five hundred pounds a year, and spends it all, is in the same danger, from accident, of being liable to the bounty of, or maintenance by, others. To me, Mr. Cobbett's expression is one thrown in for argument, rather than as conveying any precise opinion on the quantity or quality of maintenance and clothing. The subject of his letter to Lord John Russell was, not so much as to what the labourers ought to have, as to shew that they had not enough of the necessaries of life, and that such a committee, or such a parliament, as that of which the Lord was a member, had neither the ability, nor the means, to accomplish their professed object—the amelioration of the condition of the labouring class.

With respect to the question of an equal division of the land, I am of opinion, that it would be well to get this impracticable notion out of the heads of those who amuse themselves with it. The land is certainly a fixed and permanent quantity, as far as the words *fixed and permanent*, will apply to any thing; but what is mankind? An evanescent thing; here to day and gone to morrow; incessantly changing its identities; by some being born and some dying; so that, unless it were both useful and practicable to make an equal division of land among the survivors, every twenty four hours, the whole matter would be confusion and clamour. The only practicable thing that approaches the nearest to this equal division of land is, to put a tax per acre upon it, as recommended by Mr. Harrison Wilkinson, and leave the whole people and system of society untaxed. Then, those, who held more or less of land, would pay more or less of rent to those who hold none. This is the only means of making an equal division of the value of the land, and this would be so far free from confusion, as to quiet one half of the confusion and clamour that now exists. Upon this principle,

no man would hold more land than he could cultivate, improve, and turn to some advantage. There would be then no waste land, but that which was in itself waste and barren. Another practicably equal division of land than this, I cannot conceive. And were such a division of the land made I cannot conceive the possibility of a redundant population.

Redundant population is a question that has created much of discussion, and of angry discussion, of late: but to me it seems, that there is either a mental or a partial misunderstanding between the parties. They who say *redundant population*, do not say that there are more than the produce of the earth will support; the acknowledged abundance of food sets aside that idea; but they say, or mean that the consumption is not great enough for the producing power, by which a given number will always be unemployed, and in a state of starvation; for such is now the state of society, that, if you have no money, nor any hired means of applying your labour, you can have no food. Under this state of things, to the unemployed, an abundance is a real famine. If there were not that abundance, their labours would be required to produce it, and by that labour they would feed: so that a slight famine would leave less of real misery, than an abundance leaves where there is not enough of labour to purchase it for consumption.

This state of things makes the superficial observer, who feels it, to cry out against the unequal division of the land; and to think, that if he had a few acres, he could produce for his own necessary consumption. So he would, and the root of the existing evil is, that a vast multitude is deprived of the means of consumption. Every one has the will to consume; but every one has not the means. And if the means to consume existed, we should hear nothing about the evils of a distressing superabundance on the one hand, existing with a distressing want of necessities on the other. The first duty of the Government is to arrange matters, that the unemployed shall find the means of consuming the superabundance. The great business of life, the foundation of all traffic, is consumption. Though a thing must be produced before it can be consumed, still the promise of consumption is the motive to call it into existence. If the agriculturist tills his ground, his eye is always upon the market where he is to find the consumer. The consumer is the first and last object in all speculations and calculations. The same is the case with the manufacturer; and the same is the

case even with the scribbler. The question with me always is, who will, or how many will, consume (read) what I write.

In London, there is a sort of class, or society or connection of persons, composed of Physicians, Literati, Political Economists, Members of Parliament, with men and *women* of the first rank in point of fortunes and titles, so convinced of a redundancy of population, as to recommend a means of preventing conception on copulation! The practice, though new to England, they say, is not new to Europe; it has been imported from France; and much is said about the good effect of regulating the number of a family, according to the income of the parents. The foundation of this recommendation is declared to be the greatest happiness of the greatest number; that this and this alone is the motive. In applying the principle to the labouring class, it is argued, that it is to their advantage, to have work plenty and workmen scarce, so that the masters shall be induced to bid one against the other, as to the price of labour, until they give the highest that their profits will admit. And further, this scheme of lessening population is defended upon the humane principle, that it is better to have one thousand in number and all happy, than ten thousand and all miserable, from the competition as to the price of labour being on the side of the workmen, each seeking a situation by offering to work for less than another. They make their calculations of human labour, as of every other property and commodity, comparing or contrasting the supply with the demand, the quantity in the market with the means of consumption; and say, that, whatever may be the exceptions, this is the general rule, and the proper guide both for statesmen and philanthropists upon which to make their calculations.

This anti-conception scheme was communicated to me above two years since. My first impressions of it were those of *abhorrence*, and such as I have witnessed from every person to whom I have seen or known the subject mentioned, as a first impression. The friend, who made the communication to me, who has furnished me with much information since I have been a prisoner and who had passed his first impressions of the matter, by deep cogitation, wished me to think of it and to say all that I could say against it to him, and he would engage to have it answered and refuted. I wrote away fluently about its being calculated to undermine the last prop of chastity with the young, and to make conjugal fidelity or infidelity a joke. In short I felt and

wrote like a prude upon the subject; for I always was a bit of a prude, and whatever I did or thought, I could never bear to write or speak upon what I then considered obscene matters. Now, I see, that the word obscenity cannot apply as an obnoxious word to any matters that are either natural or useful: and that immense mischief arises from the practice of encouraging an ignorance upon topics, which are considered a human secret, and which every one is left to find out by instinct. This is a species of barbarity, or barbarous civilization, that will wear away, as we grow wiser; and topics now apparently forbidden become matters of ordinary conversation and philosophical discussion. We cannot know too much of any thing that concerns us. I recollect well, that, after I had received answers to all my objections, and when I was in that state of mind, that I could hardly say whether I felt refuted or not, I thought to put a clinching question, by saying: "But after all that can be said between ourselves, as friends, who is the man that dares to broach this subject to the public? I confess, that I dare not, bold as I have been in attacking their prejudices upon subjects equally or more obnoxious." My friend answered, that *he dared to do it!* aye, and now tells me that he is doing it to good purpose: I am sure, that, if he had said to me in 1822, that in September, 1824, I should venture to hint such a thing to the public in a delicate manner, I should have put some very haughty and indignant questions as to what he thought of my character and disposition! Such a strange thing is prejudice that "spider of the mind!" But simple and innocent as is this matter, much as I have since thought about it, and much as my prejudices have been shaken on the point, I am not prepared to advocate it: I introduce it here, as an illustration of what is thought and said about *redundant population*.

It is supposed, that the very Cabinet is acquainted with, and favourable to, this anti-conception scheme; from the quality and connections of the persons who are its advocates. But with me, a prior question, is what can be done for existing and thriving *conceptions*, by removing all those impediments to happiness which arise from bad government and bad habits, bad social and bad self-government. I am not for waiting another generation, to remove that which is wrong in the present. Let us go at it at once and not leave it for our more scanty posterity to do. The present evils arise from present wrongs, and the straight forward and proper

course for manly action, appears to me to be, to strike at once at the source of existing evils, and not to calculate upon an absence of individuals to suffer in another generation. They may be Christians, who advocate this anti-conception scheme; but I neither know nor think of hereafter, I live, and think, and act for the present, or immediate future, that will be to me present. I wish happiness to my children, after my body has been on the funeral pile; but I also wish to *see* them happy.

Mr. Cobbett asserts, that the population of this island has not increased, and his arguments do not want solidity, when he refers to so many once populous districts that are now comparatively depopulated. Nor have I ever felt the disposition to make that excuse for bad government, in saying, *that the growing misery of the multitude grows from a redundancy or an increase of population*. It is an abstruse question, a question to be cavilled upon, but not to be decided; therefore, I prefer to attack known, real, and visible evils, rather than to waste my fire upon a shadow, or a question as abstruse as the *one* immaculate conception! Conception keeps occurring; there seems to be three sorts—*conception real—conception prevented, or anti-conception—and conception immaculate*. This is enough about conception; is it not reader? I begin to think so; though I feel a sort of Jewish inspiration upon the subject. The Christians never were inspired, save he who wrote the Apocalypse; and Judge Bailey says, that *that* was conceived (conception again!) in a dream. Perhaps, written in a dream! The Christian Judge says, that to be *in the spirit*, is to be *in a trance or vision*, which is a *dream*! Here I have *conceived* as much as ever the Marchioness of Newcastle did in one night. That first English female Materialist! She made a man servant sleep in the same room with her, not in the same bed, and when a new thought occurred, she would say get up, John, and strike a light, I conceive, or have conceived. So, John, had to get a light, and hold it whilst she noted down her conceptions, and some of them were really and wonderfully immaculate! Then John had to put out the light and lay down, until his lady conceived again! It is this *conception* that makes man a riddle to himself—and such a riddle as no one has yet solved. He knows every thing but himself!

The remedy for this supposed redundant population, I take to be, to educate them well, and to give them good government as a consequence. With this I'll warrant, that this

Island will support ten times the number of its present inhabitants, with all the wholesome necessities of life—with all that can make life happy. Knock away the corrupt pillars of church and state—of religion established by law, and of law established by religion—get rid of a profuse monarchy, of a vile priesthood, and of a pensioned aristocracy as a legislature, and you will find no redundant population. You will find no superabundance and a famine existing at the same time, and the former the declared, the astonishing, though here well explained, cause of the latter. Strike at the root of the evil, and not at the evil which grows from the root, and still grows if smitten. Be wise! Be Atheists! Be honest!

CONTINUATION OF AN ANALYSIS OF DUPUIS.

TO RICHARD CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

FELLOW CITIZEN,

Monday, August 3, 1824.

OUR author now proceedeth to explain astronomically a famous monument of the Mithriac Religion. The epoch to which this monument referreth must be very remote, as we find the vernal and autumnal Equinoxes indicated by two Signs of the Zodiac which ceased to correspond with them more than 2400 years before the reign of Augustus. When the Bull and the Scorpion were superseded by the Ram (or Lamb) and the Balance, it was natural that a parallel change should take place with regard to the objects of Solar worship. The Hindus, whose religion is far more ancient than ours, have, to the present day, no greater consolation, at the last moment of their existence, that to lay hold of the tail of a *cow*, and to have themselves religiously sprinkled with its dung and urine. But when, among us, the believer in a more modern superstition prepareth for a future life, the body and blood of the *Lamb* is brought to him. In such ancient monuments as that which Dupuis describeth the blood of the *Bull* runneth down upon the ground; and according to Casali, the blood of the *Lamb*, which reclineth at the foot of the cross, used to be represented as received in chalice.

It is asserted by Boulanger, as well as by Dupuis, that Mithra (like Christ) was born at the winter Solstice. Mithra

was born out of a rock; and Christ, after being born in a stable, was, according to St. Justinus, sheltered in a grotto. Who are the persons that come to pay homage to the infant Jesus? The Magi, who were no doubt priests of Zoroaster and adorers of Mithra. What do they offer him? Gold, myrrh, and frankincense, all which things, according to Kircher, are consecrated to the Sun. It is Astrology, which informeth the Magi that the expected God is born. They declare that they saw his star in the East. This is the very point of the horoscope; when indeed they must have seen the Celestial Virgin suckling her child.

Now one of the names of Virgo is Ceres; and Ceres, according to Hesychius, calleth herself a "holy Virgin," though we know that Ceres was the mother of the youthful Bacchus of the mysteries. In the Persian Sphere described by Scaliger, we read, in the first decan of Virgo (a decan affected to the Sun) "Here is a beautiful Virgin, with flowing hair, carrying two ears of corn in her hand. She is seated on a throne, and is bringing up a little child whom she suckleth and feedeth." Again, in an Arabic MS. preserved in the French National Library, Virgo is represented with a child at her side, very much in the same manner, as the Mother of God is represented in Roman Catholic Temples. The Arabian Astronomer Abulmâsher hath given us the very name of this child. "In the first decan of the Sign Virgo (according to the most ancient traditions of the Persians, the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and of Hermas and Esculapius) there is a damsel, whose Persian name is "Seclenidos de Darzama" which in Arabic is translated "Adrenedefa" that is a virgin; a chaste damsel, I say, an immaculate virgin, of good heighth and the handsome countenance, in a modest dress, with long hair, holding two Ears of Corn in her hand, sitting on a throne, nourishing, and giving suck, in a place called "Hebræa," to a Boy, called by some nations "Jesus" (by which they mean EZA*) and whom in Greek we call "Christ." This passage is cited by Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, and a variety of other authors; and I cannot help thinking, that, notwithstanding Abulmâsher died so late as A. D. 805, or according to others A. D. 885, yet still this testimony, said to be founded "on most ancient traditions," is absolutely unanswerable. It is, I suppose, in allusion to this passage, that Albertus Magnus saith: "We know that our Lord Jesus Christ was born at the rising of the Virgin;"

* Probably the same as "Issa."

and again "All the mysteries and secrets of his divine incarnation, from his conception to his ascension into heaven, were marked out by the celestial appearances, and prefigured by the stars."

I may here mention, Richard Carlile, that we are told in the Gospel of the Infancy, that Christ was born, after sunset, in a cave, which was filled with a greater light than that of the Sun. The Proteuangelion also mentioneth that Christ was born in a cave in which a miraculous light burst forth. Now, when the latter part of the Virgin riseth at midnight, the Sun is in Capricornus, (which Sign, in the Labour of Hercules, answereth to the stable of Augias) while, on the Meridian, is the constellation of the Ass, and that of the manger called the stable of Jupiter. According to Abulfaragius, Zoroaster told the Magi, that the birth of Christ would be announced by a star, in the middle of which would appear the figure of a young virgin. Others say that the figure was to be that of a little child. This prophecy of Zoroaster, which is quoted by Voltaire, as well as by Dupuis, is said indeed to have been forged by the Gnostics, but is at any rate very ancient.

Our author next alludeth to certain Astrological numbers which we meet with in the Christian Legends. We read, in the second of the Clementine Homilies, that "Jesus had twelve Apostles, according to the twelve months of the year; and that, as John baptized every day he had thirty disciples, according to the thirty days of the month." The Valentinians said "the Apostles were transferred to the the twelve Signs of the Zodiac: for as Generation proceedeth from the Signs, so Regeneration proceedeth from the Apostles." St. Peter the first of the attendants of Christ is represented with the ship and the keys of Janus, who presided over the first of the months. Indeed Janus is the name of a star in the feet of Virgin, and must have risen at the very hour when the solitical year began. It was probably in allusion to Janus that the Manicheans represented the Father of Majesty as having four faces, and as being surrounded by twelve Powers, of whom they spoke as of the twelve great Gods.

The Persians, according to Hyde, have twelve angels who preside over the twelve months; and the one who presideth over the first month is called "the Treasurer of Paradise." The Valentinians supposed, that Christ suffered twelve months after his baptism, in order that his preaching might exactly complete a year—a supposition which remindeth

one of the twelve labours of Hercules, which according to Dupuis' Theory, occupied as many successive months.

The disciples of Christ are nearly seventy two, which number is referred by Josephus to the planetary system. Besides, Zoroaster is reported to have said, that God, at the end of 3000 years, sent his will, all brilliant with Light, and clothed with a human form. The will was accompanied by seventy of his principal Angels. Beausobre observeth, that the number of Angels or Genii, who divided the Earth among them, after the confusion of tongues was, also seventy. I might conclude these observations upon Astrological numbers by expressing my surprise, that no one hath ever compared the seven Deacons to the seven Planets; especially as St. Epiphanius referreth to the number of the Deacons, as a proof of the perfection and mystery of the number seven.

The Jesuit Riccioli calleth the Virgin of the Zodiac "Virgo Deipara;" and Isidorus of Seville calleth the Mother of Christ "Maria Illuminatrix. The mother of Mary was Anna; and the Romans personified the year under the name of 'Anna Perenna,' who was herself taken by some for Themis, the celestial virgin. The Roman Calendar of Columella informeth us, that on the 20th of August "the Sun entereth Virgo," *i. e.* Virgo disappeareth in the Sun's rays. On that day the Greeks and Romans celebrated the assumption of Astrea; and on the same day, says Dupius (though I think he ought to have said 'five days previous') we celebrate the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary," which festival appeareth to have been formerly called, "The Passage of the Virgin." Again we read, in the calendar before mentioned, that on the 11th of the Sept. "the middle of Virgo riseth," *i. e.* appeareth for the first time. "On the same day," saith Dupuis (or probably three days previous) we celebrate the Nativity of the Mother of Christ."

Our author now presenteth us with an engraving of one of the lateral doors of the Cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris. Here we find all the Signs of the Zodiac arranged in the order of the Planetary domiciles—with the exception of Virgo, who is seen portrayed in the middle of the door, with her child in her arms, while at her feet a serpent is climbing up the branch of a tree, reminding one of the Serpent of the Poles, which was called "coluber arborem conscendens." But it is not only in the city formerly celebrated for its worship of the Goddess Isis, but also in St. Denys, and Strasbourg, that Dupuis telleth us we may trace and Signs of the Zodiac

upon the entrance of the Cathedral. I have myself observed the greater part of them on the Portal of St. Denys; and I should recommend any of the readers of this letter, who dwell in the neighbourhood of old Gothic churches, to examine whether we have not, in our own country, sculptured proofs of the astronomical origin of Christianity.

But to continue. The writer of the *Alexandrian Chronicle* telleth us: "Down to the present day, the Egyptians consecrate the lying-in of a Virgin, and adore an infant placed in a manger. When the King Ptolemæus asked the reason of this, he was answered, that it was a mystery handed down to our fore-fathers by a holy Prophet." Dupuis next informeth us, that "a virgin who was about to bring forth" was honoured by the Gauls of the territory of Chartres; but as I am told, that this is a mere Monkish Legend, I pass on to the examination of a Mithriac Monument, found at Oxford in 1747, and in which we see, among the figures in the lower division, a woman who is just going to give suck to her child. William Stukely, in his dissertation upon this marble considereth, in the true spirit of a Christian, that the festival, which the Persians called the "night of Light, the birth-day of Mithra" (or of "the Mediator" as he explaineth the name) was a patriarchal festival, imagined in consequence of the prophecies which referred to the birth of the Messiah. He telleth us, that the Druids celebrated the night by a general illumination, and that it is still the custom, in some parts of Great Britain, to light up fires on the night of the Epiphany. He remarketh that the Mithriac religion was spread over the whole of the Roman Empire, and was extremely prevalent in Gaul and Great Britain. He also quoteth St. Hieronymus, from whom we learn, that the festivals of Adonis were celebrated in a cave, like those of Mithra; and that this cave was the one at Bethlehem in which Christ was born. Finally, he citeth an old father, supposed to be St. Chrysostomus, who alludeth in these terms to the great Equinoxial festival. "Ye talk of the birth of the Invincible—Who is this Invincible, if it be not our Lord? Ye call that the birth-day of the Sun—It is he that is the true Sun of Righteousness."

I shall conclude these observations by the remark of our author, that the Christians have understood mystically, what they ought to have understood literally; and that St. Augustinus did not understand his religion, when he said: "We are right in celebrating the birth of our Lord on this day—not because the Sun is then born, but because the

Lord hath created the Sun." This last passage may remind one of the doubts expressed in a treatise of Plutarchus, that Apollo may not be the Sun, but the Lord and Father of the Sun. Leaving to my brother Republicans the trouble of summing up all the preceding evidence with regard to the astronomical Birth of Christ, I propose commencing in my next letter an abridgment of what Dupuis saith, concerning the Death and Resurrection of this Solar Deity.

Believe me, fellow Citizen,

THY FRIEND.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Greatham, near Stockton-upon-Tees,

UNDAUNTED CITIZEN,

September 16, 1824.

I FEEL that it will be impossible to find words of sufficient energy, to represent to you, the very great pleasure I now share in being enabled to transmit to you a collection amounting to £3. 12s. That sum has been subscribed by a few friends, as a sincere mark of their high regard for your eminent abilities, and indefatigable exertions in the cause of truth and universal philanthropy: and also, as an indubitable token of their abhorrence for that system of tyranny and savage cruelty, exercised by Church and State; which, not satiated with torturing the enslaved carcase, will have recourse to the basest acts of injustice, to oppress and shackle the mind of man.

It is almost impossible for any individual, unless his intellectual faculties are deeply saturated with religious idolatry, or thoroughly imbued with governmental dishonesty, not to reflect, at least, upon the powers, which, in the origin of nations, the associated people had a right to grant to their chosen rulers, as well as upon *those* which they had not. They certainly had the power of placing themselves under the direction, management, and controul, of any person, chief, or family, whether under the denomination of Duke, or King, or Emperor. They might grant him the autocracy over them. They might assign to him the power to keep them *silent* or motionless; and they might bind themselves to think or move how and when he pleased. But what right, in the name of common sense, had they to bind *any* of their posterity? If they had a mind to obey the most cruel, brutal, and senseless laws—why should we? If their ignorance could suffer some of their more crafty follow men to rule them with a rod of iron—why should we suffer others do the same? Perhaps, there may still be found some person to exclaim, that our governors, both in Church

and State, do not rule over the people by any human, but by a divine commission. To such it would be sufficient to reply, that it is incumbent on the part of our rulers to shew their legatine powers from their celestial autocrat, before they can justly insist on the tithes and taxes with which they have so unmercifully loaded, imposed upon, and overwhelmed mankind.

Indeed, nothing can be more lamentable, than the situation in which the ruled part of our species is placed. Let a man turn his attention to the ecclesiastical dogmas, and he will find himself bidden to work six days out of every seven, and to bring the tenth part of the produce of his labour to the church, as it is called; in return for which, he is to repair to a damp and unwholesome place on every seventh day, only to get his mind filled with pills made up of nonsense, gilded over with a few grains of morality, and not dismissed without abundance of promises of immense rewards in heaven, or of everlasting punishments in hell: places which, it is now ascertained, never had an existence, and cannot consequently be ever realized. He will hear enough about the manifold blessings bestowed by an almighty Deity, visible in his own pantheon, and invisible in all other places; nor will the eternal tortures inflicted by, perhaps, an almighty Devil, visible in his own pandemonium, and invisible in all other quarters, be at all forgotten. Beings, who, if they did at any time exist, must, in my opinion, have gone the way of all flesh. For should we make a proper enquiry about such places and beings, we shall find ourselves foiled in the attempt, and forced to own, that they are merely the fictions of the imaginations, the fabrications of ignorance, or the inventions of knavery. I, for my part, cannot find them; and all I can perceive is, matter operating, moving, or acting, at all points, upon matter; that is, upon itself, either in a combined or gaseous form. I see that wood, iron, stone, earth, &c. can be reduced to their simple elementary gases. I observe matter falling upon the surface of the earth, commixing with it, and sending forth multitudes of vegetative plants, and swarms of animalcula, all which decompose again or die. Whence, I come to the conclusion, that MATTER IN MOTION is the great first cause of every existing identity; that effects, are but the results of an infinitude of changes, which the motion of matter, whether in a combined or fluid state, must effect. Man, beast, trees, air, water, fire, earth, and planets, are so many varieties of matter; the particles of which each is composed, being indestructible, can never be annihilated; though they will enter into a variety of combinations to perpetuity. Ideas of supernatural agency have been the offspring of ignorance; it is ignorance that has ever brought on man every kind of pain and misery. It is the same that has caused the cruelty, or knavery, or both, in those individuals, who have so shamefully thrown you and your philanthropic men into a loathsome prison; and it is to the same source of ignorance, that

the slavery, both of body and mind, into which the people are plunged, is likewise to be attributed. A condition which can only be ameliorated by a progressive improvement of their mental faculties. "Knowledge is power," said a celebrated writer; but he would have been more correct, had he said "Knowledge is happiness." For knowledge alone can make a man virtuous for virtue's sake, and constitute his real felicity.

So extensively propagated is the system of imposture by the dishonest and ignorant few over the cheated many, that I fear it will require the lapse of centuries to eradicate it from the earth. Let a man commit a rape, a robbery, or even a murder, he has still a chance of escaping punishment. But let him publish any writing, tending in the least to open the eyes of his fellow creatures, and he is sure of being put upon, what is generally known by the appellation of, a "Mock Trial;" where he is brought before twelve, either of the most stupid, or the most villainous of his species, selected by his very accusers, or by men interested in his ruin. A victim to such lawless power, he may make what defence he chooses, (but he must not offend the ear of the Lord Judge); his argument may be, what they generally are, as irresistible as an adamant rock, or as clear as the meridian sun; but then, his Judge, his Jury, and accusers, are all on one side of the question. Guilty he must be found, and guilty he is found; and punished with more than inhuman severity. And what is all this for? The answer must be, "to keep the people in the dark." For the moment they shall become enlightened, those very men, who now plunder them in the shape of taxes and imposts, and who can commit all sorts of crime with impunity, because they have usurped their high positions, would be quickly hurled down from their eminences, as powerless and as innoxious as lambs.

I have often amused myself, while contemplating the innumerable schemes for Parliamentary Reform, which have so frequently been presented to the public, by men of high literary attainments, some of whom have, from time to time, laid their several plans before either of the Honourable Houses, and the result has been, a conviction on the public mind, that a Reform of Parliament can only be effected from without. My opinion is, that it should be pulled down and re-erected upon an honest plan. But to effect this, superstition and idolatry must be rooted out of the majority of the people. They must learn, that so long as they foolishly relinquish every means of obtaining true happiness *here*, while they more foolishly fix their hopes in an imaginary hereafter, so long will they be the slaves and the victims of their more crafty brethren. For the truth of the foregoing observations, I need only refer you to what has passed and passes in Spain. You will see there, a fine people, inhabiting one of the finest portions of the globe, worse treated than their grazing cattle, crouching their carcasses under the throne of despotism, and bending the

knee before the holy crew, with which their God-houses abound; knowing nothing, and obeying only the omnipotent will of a wretched monster in the shape of man. Under such systems, the people can only be rendered paupers and miserable slaves.

To arrest the progress of similar evils arising from a similar system in this country, you, dear Sir, have most generously stepped forward, and sacrificing your home, your family, and your liberty, you have for nearly five years suffered, and continue to suffer, only to try whether your fellow-man be redeemable or not from the fangs of his merciless oppressors, or whether he will tear off the bandage of superstition from his eyes, or break asunder the chains of an unrighteous captivity. You have humanely undertaken to guide his faltering steps out of that frightful labyrinth of cimmerian darkness, to which a criminal apathy had bound him fast for ages without number. You have already cleared away the weeds, which a blind superstition had so successfully reared in his way to happiness, and by exhorting your fellow mortals to shake off all supernatural chimeras, you have lastly placed him on the grand road to true honour, real glory, and solid felicity. LET HIM FOLLOW.

I remain, benevolent Sir,

Yours, in civic esteem,

J. E. ELLERKER.

From Stockton.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
J. E. Ellerker, Esq. Greatham	20	0	A man who thinks for himself	1	0
Democritus	5	0	Daniel Gibson	1	0
Susanna Wright, who is honoured by the name	2	0	Rebert Harrison	1	0
Man and wife	2	0	Thomas Blakelock	1	0
Another man and wife	2	0	Edward Fawell	1	0
Thomas Weblear	1	0	Edward Blakestone	1	0
Robert Spicer	1	0	One who thinks, but says little	1	0
A wise man	1	0	A Friend to Free Discussion,		
A Methodist!!!	1	0	by T. W.	0	6
Thomas Shepherd	1	0	A Republican	0	6
John Turnbull	1	0	An Enemy to Priestcraft	0	6
A Craft	1	0	George Rymer	0	6
Robert Garbutt	1	0	Thomas Paine, at whose		
An Old Sceptic	1	0	torch the greatest political		
			writer of the age first light-		
			ed his flambeaux	2	0

From Stokesley.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Robert Armstrong, a Materialist (1	0	The Ghost of "Old Chop		
A Materialist	2	6	Logic"	0	6
Henry Wilson	1	0	A Hypocrite	0	6
John Flounders	1	0	George Hall, a slave to no		
			sect	1	0

to express our feelings of the person whom we address, to be in the contents of the letter, and not in the appellatives. I am sure, that I could write the most flattering letter without a single flattering appellative; and under the most flattering appellatives, I could cloak the most bitter sarcasms. So, I deem it to be the right course, in this and in every other matter, to avoid that which is fulsome. With one friend with whom I correspond, we neither use heads nor tails to our letters; but write on, as if we were conversing: a knowledge of the hand writing being equivalent to personal knowledge. Another, adopts the old Roman stile: J. H. to R. C.—Health, &c. ending with a *vale* or *farewell*. This last stile, for manly simplicity, exceeds all the customs that have been in use: and that very simplicity, is dignity itself, in comparison with the modern titles of a Sicilian, or of any other aristocracy.

The use of the Mr. seems to exist more as a distinction for age, than for any other purpose; and as it becomes a substitute for the Christian name, it can scarcely be said to be superfluous. Its original expression of MASTER seems to be lost in the common abbreviation and corrupted pronunciation as *Mister*. We now ridicule the *Maister* of the peasant, but forget, that his pronunciation is much more correct than our *Mister*, and comes near to the Magister of the Romans. Who will say, that the Romans did not commonly pronounce it *Maister*? The French retain nearly the same expression in *Maitre*, which is one proof. It often occurs to me, that what we now consider the broad and coarse pronunciation of our peasantry, or widely scattered country people, was once the most polished language of our ancestors; and I venture to say, that the court dialect of Queen Elizabeth's reign was nothing superior to that which now offends the ear of a courtier, and still exists in the sequestered farm house and cottage: though the general establishment of schools is doing much to change and render uniform the language. The greater the intercourse of persons, the greater the change in language; but the jeered peasant may remind the scoffer at his dialect, that such was the most polished dialect of his forefathers. You may yet find traces, in the dialects of different counties, of every serious invasion that has taken place since the time of the Romans: the stronger impression being retained in the most remote districts. The word *Esquire* has drawn me into this digression; but seeing that the subscription list began and ended with an Esquire, a sort of novelty in my general lists of subscribers, I

thought it became me to say a word upon the subject; particularly, to a man of your mind, too strong and too sensible to be offended at it.

I begin the real subject of this letter, by congratulating you, a native of Cuba, that Monarchy is extinct in Mexico, and that even the tyrant and usurper Iturbide has been shot! In my view, this promises a speedy emancipation to the Island of Cuba. The calm and dignified manner in which he was sent out of that country, assured me, that his case was hopeless there; and the still more calm and dignified manner in which he has been most deservedly shot as a traitor to his country and his engagement with its people, assures me that monarchy is extinct in North America: for the Canadas are not worthy of being called an exception. They will fall in another American war, if they do not assert their independence before. Conquest would be liberty to the people of Canada. It would be emancipation from slavery.

I am very desirous of seeing the Island of Cuba declare itself an independant Republic; though I am fully sensible that the inhabitants do not yet know enough about MATTER AND MOTION to make the best use of such an advantage. And pure Republics will never exist with a priesthood. There must be an utter extirpation of idolatry to constitute a pure Republic. A theocracy is not a jot better than an aristocracy or a monarchy; and every shade of religious as well as of political idolatry corrupts that which bears the name of a Republic. So that there will not be a pure Republic in any part of America within the present century. The people of the next century may expect to see it.

We must be rid of priests as well as of kings to establish a Republic and to have good government. And the grand object towards this attainment is, that each individual should proclaim aloud that he can do better without that with either priest or king. We want neither church nor state trappings, to constitute good government; nor shall we have good government whilst we retain them. Government is a matter of business, and has no more need of a gaudy ostentation, than a merchant has to carry on his mercantile affairs. Where there is much of ostentation, it affords a sure proof that the business is neglected. A King ought to be a hard working man, incessantly at business, and ought to think less about luxuries and indulgences of appetite than any other man. Our European Kings are mere pampered idols, useless animals, that exist only to complete the juggle of priestcraft upon the people: the mere tools of the priests

and aristocracy. There is attached to the office of King or President of a country much more of real business, than any other man can possibly have; for he has in some measure the concerns of all in his hands: and those concerns to be well managed require the greatest attention, the most close application, the most persevering industry; for the moment he acts by deputy, his office is vitiated, and instead of one we are subject to many kings, which brings on all sorts of intrigue to undermine each other, and occasions a wasteful expenditure of the public revenue. In this country, we have not less than a thousand kings, or presidents, and each, instead of making the best application, for the public, of the public revenue, tries how much of it he can draw away into his own circle of family, friends, acquaintances, and dependants. So that, in reality, the English Monarchy is at perpetual war with the English people, and even treating them as a conquered people: thinks of nothing but the raising of contributions. We have all the ills of a monarchy, all the ills of an aristocracy, and all the ills of a theocracy; and this is what is lauded as our glorious constitution of church and state made up of three estates! Each encourages the other to plunder the property-producing part of the people; and each proclaims itself and the others, as the best of all possible systems! So it is for themselves; but not for they who produce the property of the nation. One third of the property swallowed up by these three estates would be equal to all the purposes of good government without them. Ten millions of pounds sterling, well applied annually, would support a formidable naval and military system efficient for every purpose of defence and protection of commerce, and a civil system, that should be alike efficient and respectable, which is not now the case with all the wasteful expenditure to which we are subject. And we are free from military massacre only, whilst we are quiet under this state of things! Certainly, ours is a beautiful system!

This monarchy, aristocracy, and theocracy is the same series of evils which afflict the people of Spain, only, they have it more severe, in consequence of having less knowledge than the people of this country. The amount of revenue drawn from them is not so great, because they have not the capacity to produce that revenue. The same series of ills exist throughout Europe, and even the Republics of America retain an odious and expensive theocracy, with a set of men who will, if allowed, assume the powers of an aristocracy. The germ of all tyranny is the ignorance of the people.

There will always be tyrants whilst there are ignorant men disposed to be slaves; for mankind are every where naturally made of the same sort of matter. The first principle towards putting down tyranny is, for every man, or for a majority, to resolve not to be slaves. Every man should so resolve as far as the power in him lies to emancipate himself: and with this disposition, the majority would soon feel power enough to prevent any man from playing the tyrant over them. The effort began in Spain; but the neighbouring tyrants were alarmed for themselves, and interfered to restore the falling tyranny: and wretched is the restoration! The constitution will by and by come back again with a vengeance, from the contrast which the present state of things affords to the renovation produced by a legislative Cortes. Even our hired writers confess, that the present state of things in that country cannot, nor ought not to, continue.

Returning thanks to you and all friends in your neighbourhood for their support, I remain, resolved to war on with tyranny and ignorance, and to court the support of good men only,

Yours and theirs,

RICHARD CARLILE.

From a few Friends near Red Lion Street.

	For Aug.	s.	d.	For Sept.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Mr. H. and Wife,	4th subscription	1	6	5th do.	1	6	3	0
Mr. G. S. J. and Wife,	4th do.	1	6	5th do.	1	6	3	0
Mr. J. R.	4th do.	1	0	5th do.	1	0	2	0
M. G. S., Sen.	4th do.	1	0	5th do.	1	0	2	0
Mr. Jones Materialist							1	0
Mr. Emery, for August and September							1	0

Received through the hands of Mr. Watts.

To General Carlile, and	W. Bennet	1	6
his Brave Officers in	J. Barnard	0	6
Exile, may their exertions never cease whilst a Tyrant does exist.	Secret Service Money	1	0
	D. King, for Mr. Carlile	2	6
	Do. for Joseph Swann	2	6
Mr. Watts	Do. Collected for Mr.		
J. M.	Carlile	3	0
T. Morris		2	0

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 34, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.